



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

7. The organization of such a permanent International Court of Justice: how the members should be appointed; how its powers should be limited and defined; how its proceedings should be regulated; when and where its terms should be held, etc.

8. The advantages which would result from a codification of the laws of nations by the members of such International Court, when not engaged in the trial of cases.

9. The laws of nations relating to peace and war, and what reforms should be recommended therein.

10. The relations of the burdens of war to the welfare of the common people.

11. The grounds of fraternal union in the language, literature, domestic life, religion, science, art, and civil institutions of different peoples.

12. The establishment of the principles of judicial justice as the supreme law of international relations.

13. How far non-coercive methods may be expected to produce satisfactory results.

14. Whether it would be expedient to establish Courts of Conciliation and to compel all suitors in the first instance to resort thereto; but leaving them free to apply to the Tribunals of Litigation, unless pending a hearing in the Court of Conciliation the parties shall consent to abide by such judgment as it may deem proper.

15. The establishment of appropriate tribunals for the summary settlement of conflicts between labor and capital.

16. The practical results of arbitration as applied to the settlement of private controversies; especially among the members of associations.

17. The moral and social aspects of war.

18. Historic review of the results of arbitration in the settlement of international controversies.

19. The religious movement of the age, in favor of peace.

The experience of Denmark and Norway for nearly a century in Courts of Conciliation, by which seventy-five per cent. of the controversies brought before them were finally settled, is of the most instructive and encouraging character. Not less impressive is the remarkable history of Arbitration in the Board of Trade of Chicago, embracing a great number of controversies, immense aggregates of values, and remarkably satisfactory results.

The several Committees of Arrangements of the World's Congress Auxiliary, are for the most part local in their character. Each of them has, however, a relatively large Advisory Council of persons eminent in the subject matter of the Congress, and selected from the different participating countries of the world. This Advisory Council constitutes the non resident, but still active branch of the Committee of Arrangements. The mode of coöperation is by individual correspondence, and otherwise as occasion may permit.

As the time until the Congress is comparatively brief, and diligence in making arrangements for it is therefore required, international jurists and the principal officers of Peace Societies throughout the world are requested to act as members of the Advisory Council of the Congress of Arbitration and Peace, and without ceremony or delay to favor the undersigned Committee of Arrangements with their suggestions of themes to be considered, persons to present those themes, and of the modes of proceeding deemed most advisable. All such suggestions will receive

the most attentive consideration in forming the programme for the Congress. At the same time, the Committee appends to this Address a partial list of the persons selected to act as members of its Advisory Council, and to whom formal notices of their appointment have been sent. The Committee did not deem it necessary to wait until letters of acceptance could be received from the persons so selected, but felt warranted in taking the liberty to recommend the persons selected to the President of the World's Congress Auxiliary for appointment, subject to such acceptance. Additions to this list will be made from time to time as occasion may require. All persons named in this list, or otherwise specially interested, are cordially invited to favor the Committee with their suggestions on the points above designated.

Communications may be addressed to the Chairman of the Committee at the headquarters named below; and the publications of the Auxiliary relating to the subject will be furnished on request.

THOMAS B. BRYAN, *Chairman.*

MURRAY F. TULEY, *Vice-Chairman.*

BENJ. F. TRUEBLOOD, LL. D.,	JAMES T. RALEIGH,
ALLEN W. FLITCRAFT,	GEORGE F. STONE,
J. M. FISKE,	JESSE A. BALDWIN,
WILLIAM B. BOGERT,	GEORGE N. BOARDMAN,
T. J. LAWRENCE, LL. D.,	CHARLES H. HOWARD,

*General Committee of the World's Congress Auxiliary
on a Congress of Arbitration and Peace.*

MRS. THOMAS J. LAWRENCE, *Chairman,*

MRS. MARTHA FOOTE CROW, MRS. FREDERICK A. SMITH,
MRS. I. S. BLACKWELDER,

Woman's Committee on Arbitration and Peace.

WORLD'S CONGRESS HEADQUARTERS,
CHICAGO, February, 1893.

OUGHT CHRISTIANS TO ENGAGE IN WAR?

Supplementary to

"THE DRESS PARADE AT WEST POINT."

BY JOSIAH W. LEEDS.

An estimable minister and professor, a man of large mental endowments and extensive knowledge of books, having lately read "The Dress Parade at West Point," a peace tract written by me several years ago, and of which several editions have been printed, sent me a letter excepting to some passages. His letter, omitting name, is printed below, in full; likewise my response. Before sending the latter, however, there came to my mind an incident occurring in the history of colonial Pennsylvania (the year 1747) which I will briefly narrate.

At that time much excitement prevailed in Philadelphia, growing out of rumors of hostile designs on the part of the French. With the object of weakening the testimony against war, as held by a body so numerous and influential in the city as Friends then were and "to attempt to remove the scruples of such, who, by their religious principles, are hindered from joining in the Association" [for defence against the French], a prominent clergyman preached and published a discourse upon the text, "The Lord is a Man of War" (Exodus xv. 3). To this publication, so full of the old way of reprisal which our Lord Jesus Christ determinately put aside, so opposed

to those peace principles of the founders of the province in which they and their successors had happily continued upward of sixty years, reply was made by John Smith (brother of Samuel Smith, historian of New Jersey), in a pamphlet entitled "The Doctrine of Christianity, as held by the people called Quakers, vindicated, in answer to G. Tennant's sermon on the Lawfulness of War." Previous to sending out this pamphlet, J. S. believed it his duty to lay it before one or more judicious, religiously-minded members of the Society, that he might be assured it contained naught in matter, not well-grounded, nor in manner to which exception could reasonably be taken either by the direct recipient or by the public.

In the present instance, apprehending that the cause of peace might be subserved by the publication of the two letters which follow, they were submitted, in the way above indicated, to a Friend ripe in years, sound in judgment, and well-beloved for his humble, faithful and Christ-honoring walk. Fully approving of the response which had been made, he appended this reflection: "I do not know how any professed minister of said Gospel of Christ, who has been a listener of his Sermon on the Mount, and tasted of His love, and essayed to teach it to sinners, can do other than feel constrained to exercise the same toward his fellow-creatures, and ever lift the voice and exert his influence against the barbarous, if not diabolical, system of war."

I will add that the recipient of my reply has sent me a second letter, in which he thinks that I still do not justify the quotations about the barbarity of war, and the sinful feelings imputed to some who have felt it their duty to wage war, in inviting to the witness stand, such non-religious fighters as Hooker, Wellington and Napoleon; that it would also be easy on his part, "with a little research, to array against your *list of witnesses* another on the other side." Undoubtedly this could be done, but would it conduce to the glory of God? Pleasanter to contemplate the disciple John, as "the beloved," leaning on Jesus' breast, than as calling for fire from Heaven on the village of the offending Samaritans. More Christ-like in Peter to advise as he did when fully instructed, to be "pitiful, courteous," and to "suffer for righteousness' sake," than to be striking with the sword, even in supposed defence of his Master. A great cloud of witnesses, even doughty warriors themselves, have arraigned the war system as barbarous, criminal and non-Christian. Ought *Christians* to engage in it?

JOSIAH W. LEEDS.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 25, 1893.

JOSIAH W. LEEDS:

My Dear Friend—I thank you for the kind intention which led you to send me your pamphlet on "The Dress Parade at West Point." I am not able to thank you for the pamphlet itself, whose appearance must tend to discount all the good works with which your name is associated. As such I much regret its publication.

Are you not bearing false witness against your neighbor, when you quote with your approval Joseph Hooker's statement that a man cannot be a good soldier without having the devil in him? Are you willing to have that stand as your estimate of the spirit, in which hundreds of thousands of members of the Christian Church showed themselves good soldiers in defence of our country? Of Oliver O. Howard for instance? Do you think Joseph

Hooker, who was a fighter and nothing else, is the man to pronounce upon the motives and conduct of men, who stood far above him morally and spiritually? It was precisely his want of moral stamina which made Sherman pass him by, and assign an important command to Howard, whom he "outranked." It was he who in May, 1863, announced the night before an engagement that he now "had the enemy where God Almighty could not save them," and then went into the fight with every advantage and was whipped! He was a public and coarse blasphemer, and an officer of the army once said of him that he knew nothing of either religion or war; no man to pass judgment on any good man.

Is it either just or necessary to assail the military profession in order to bring home to people the evil and horrors of war? You quote Sir Charles Napier on the latter subject. Have you ever read his famous letter to M. Gurney, a member of your own religious Society, in which he puts the case to that eminent merchant substantially thus: "You traders begin the wars; we soldiers bring them to an end." The Apostle James, in a text you often quote, traces wars and fightings to another source than the soldiers.

You object to military drill in schools. My boy was stooped in the shoulders, hollow-chested, and a promising case for consumption. A friend, who had had a boy in the same condition, had sent him to a military-drill school, with the best effect. I did the same, and my boy is now straight and firm on his feet. It is just the drill which fits a soldier for his profession which does boys a better service than any other gymnastic, without giving them the smallest disposition to fight. So "moistened eyes, quivering lips, and averted face" are rather out of harmony with the facts.

Yours in much love and true respect,

ROCOUNCEY, CHESTER CO., PENN.,

Third Month 6, 1893.

Respected Friend—Thy letter excepting to some passages in the "Dress Parade" tract reached me early in the week just past, but absence from home most of the time since then has prevented my replying until now.

Strenuous objection is made in thy letter to my quoting with approval an alleged profane general's estimate of war, because "hundreds of thousands of members of the Christian Church showed themselves good soldiers in defence of our country." I should regret very much indeed were the witnesses cited by me all from the side of the enemies of religion. A man wrote me the other day after reading this same tract, "I have always thought war *unadulterated savagery*," and he added, "but we, the unregenerate, shall have to fight, I fear, for many years to come." That writer was Junius Henri Browne, well known as having been the war correspondent of the *New York Tribune*. Whatever be his religious belief or disbelief, he makes bold to say that this fighting business (which he had already in print arraigned as a "wild beast" business) is something for the unregenerate to attend to. The inference is just, that he would deem it an occupation that the witnesses of the new birth had naught to do with, so agreeing with the editor of the *Boston Christian* (not a bad man, I am sure), whose estimate, found in the tract, may be judged from his ejaculation, "What have Christians to do with such cruelties and crimes against humanity and against the God of peace?"

It is true that I have cited the Duke of Wellington as saying, that "men who have nice notions of religion have no business to be soldiers," and likewise the first Napoleon as averring that "war is the business of barbarians." Yet only two months ago that presumably Christian magazine, the *Chautauquan*, was frank enough editorially to allude to the appeal to war as "the barbaric resort to arms, which in an individual is now considered nothing short of a crime." Barbarism and crime! Further, we cannot but admit, that the science of war must be learnt, carefully learnt, in order to its efficient practice. Thou art probably not conversant with the Catechism of the famous Russian general, Suwarrow. In his instructions for the guidance of a good soldier, he enjoins:

"Push hard with the bayonet. The ball will lose its way, the bayonet never. The ball is a fool; the bayonet a hero. Stab once, and off with the Turk from the bayonet! Stab the second! Stab the third! A hero will stab half a dozen! If three attack you, stab the first, fire on the second, and bayonet the third!"

Ah, but thou wilt say, this is gross, this is ghastly, the righteous pursuit of war is compounded of something better. Well, then, suppose we take up a more modern compilation, the "Soldier's Pocket-book of Field Service" of Lord Wolseley, for instance. Here we learn that a soldier is to "covet honor like a true sinner," "he must be taught to despise those in civil life," "you can by spreading false news among the gentlemen of the press use them as a medium by which to deceive an enemy." This compendium of deceit was fittingly supplemented by a contribution to the *Fortnightly Review* by the same eminent authority in military matters. He observed: "All other pleasures pale before the intense, the maddening delight of leading men into the midst of an enemy, or to the assault of some well defended place. That rapturous enjoyment takes man out of himself to the forgetfulness of all earthly considerations." Surely, between the rhapsody of the Briton, and the blood-burdened catechism of the Russian, there is not much for the humanitarian and the Christian to choose.

Possibly my Scripture peace references and the non-fighting practice of the primitive Christians are held by thee to be inconclusive. I remember, years ago, in reading the Life and Works of John Wiclif, to have come across some remarkable utterances of his which should be far more widely published than has been the case. Note this passage:

"Angels withstand fiends, and many men with right of law withstand their enemies, and yet they kill them not, neither fight with them. The wise men of the world hold this for wisdom, and have thus vanquished their enemies without striking them; and men of the gospel, by patience, and the prospect of rest and peace, have vanquished, through the suffering of death, just as we may do now. But here men of the world come and say, that by this wise, kingdoms would be destroyed; but here our faith teaches that since Christ is our God, kingdoms should be thus established and their enemies overcome. But peradventure some men would lose their worldly riches, and what harm were thereof? Well indeed I know that men will scorn this doctrine."

This unpopular belief of Wiclif, I claim to be identical with that enjoined by our Divine Master, consistently carried into practice by the apostles and primitive Christians generally, exemplified by a remnant (frequently stig-

matized as "heretical" by State religionists) through the centuries since then, and in latter years, more particularly by the Religious Society of Friends. I will ask thee to mark this sentence of Dr. Vaughan, the discriminating biographer of Wiclif. Summing up his enlightened views upon the subject we are considering, he says: "It thus appears that it was not merely the act of invasion, but the slaughter of men under any circumstances, which the reformer considered as opposed to the spirit and the letter of Christianity." Barbarism, a crime, and non-Christian!

Tried by the test thou hast applied to my own unambitious essays, the foregoing utterances of "the 'Morning Star of the Reformation' must tend to discount all the good work with which [his] name is associated." How would our good townsman, Geo. Dana Boardman, also fare by this test? I remember that when that well known Baptist minister came in the course of his Association Hall discourses (afterward published) to the Sermon on the Mount, and told of Christ's assurances of blessing upon the poor in spirit, the mourners, the meek, the hungerers after righteousness, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers; and when, dwelling further upon the divinely authoritative counsel to be patient in persecution, to kill not, to restrain even anger, he reminded his hearers that the old time way of an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, is no longer permissible, but that we are to turn the other cheek when smitten, and to love, bless, do good to and pray for our enemies, I say, that when pastor Boardman had rehearsed and explained all these beautiful passages as he believed they were meant to be understood, he calmly declared: "As I feel to-day, after reflecting on the Mountain Sermon, I do not think I could defend, on any pretext, another war." Hence I feel justified in reiterating right here the feeling words of Wiclif's declaration,—“Well indeed I know that men will scorn this doctrine.”

Now, if thou wilt have patience with me, I would like to add to the testimony of the valorous Middle Ages' reformer and the worthy preacher of to-day whom I have consecutively quoted, a brief passage from an earnest speech of that eminent and philanthropic English statesman, Lord Brougham, founder of the Howard Association. He remarked: "My principles,—I know not whether they agree with yours; they may be derided, they may be unfashionable; but I hope they are spreading far and wide—my principles are contained in the words which that great man, Lord Faulkland, used to express in secret, and which I now express in public, 'Peace, PEACE, PEACE. I abominate war as unchristian. I hold it to be the greatest of human crimes!'"

In the course of my own citations (in the "Dress Parade") of the candid views of good men, as well as of some non-professors, I believe I have not approached, in giving my personal sentiments, the above stern characterization of the barbarous system on the part of the two English baronets.

Pointed reference is made in thy letter to General O. O. Howard, as being a prominent example of a good man in the military service. Not knowing him personally, I nevertheless have always had a high estimation of his character, and I repeat with emphasis here, what is said in the preface to my smaller United States History. "In essaying to treat our country's wars more concisely than is customary in school histories, the author desires not to be misunderstood as in any wise depreciating the sincerity of purpose, or the spirit of self-sacrifice which so largely

animated many who were willing to give up their lives for their country." I pleasantly recall the incident of the return of my wife's father, John B. Crenshaw, from a Washington visit to his Virginia home a few years after the war, and how he spoke of his gratification at meeting General Howard in the midst of his family, having been his guest over night. I have not forgotten, likewise, the circumstance of my father-in-law telling me of a conversation he had with General A. P. Hill, whose tent, with those of several other Confederate generals, was pitched upon the lawn of the homestead farm not far from Richmond. The general, who had been religiously brought up, deprecated war, but he said he had always been taught that it was right to defend one's fireside, and on that ground had gone into the struggle, and could earnestly pray for the success of the cause he had espoused. So I repeat what is affirmed with clearness in the tract to which thou hast excepted: "I do not deny that Christian men may have been soldiers, but can there be any question that the profession of arms is an occupation which the followers of Him who defended not Himself with the legions which He could have called, and who said, 'My Kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight,' are enjoined to come out of?"

The late Rowland B. Howard, a Congregational minister, Secretary of the American Peace Society, and brother of General O. O. Howard, in concluding a plea for peace not long before his death, remarked, "In a divinely created and ordered universe, there is, there must be, a better way [than that of settling disputes by the sword]. *It is our duty to find it.*" Professing Christendom having for long forsaken the simplicity of primitive faith and practice in this regard, we need to turn now and learn anew a lesson from the freshly impressed inhabitants of "the isles afar off." When such a thing occurs as that of the Japanese envoys to England, charged with an examination into the merits and practical workings of Christianity with a view to its possible general adoption in the land of the Mikado, making report that what they had beheld in the way of preparations by the English to fight their fellowmen were so opposed to the tenets of peace which they, the Christian English, professed, as to disincline them to suggest any change in the national religion of Japan, one may conclude that there is just occasion for reviving the Apostle Paul's sorrowful impeachment, "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written."

Said that self-denying missionary, William Ellis, referring to the Polynesian converts, "When Christianity was adopted by the people, human sacrifices, infant murder and war entirely ceased." When that fierce marauder and murderer, Afrikaner, became a Christian, he and his people put totally away their clubs and knives, their bows and arrows and spears. What an amazing transformation was that of the cannibal Fijians, so also that of the Samoan islanders! Concerning the latter people, a most interesting statement (which also ought to be far more widely known than is the case) was made two years ago at a Conference held at Redland Park, Bristol, England.

S. J. Whitmee, a missionary, stated that when he went to Samoa in 1863, he found the native Christians in those islands so fully convinced that war was utterly inconsistent with a profession of faith in Jesus Christ, that no person who took any part in war, either in promoting it as a statesman, or in engaging in it as a soldier, could

be a member of a Christian church. From the first acceptance of Christianity in the islands, this became the rule. It was adopted, not in consequence of the teaching of the earliest English missionaries upon the subject, but as a conclusion which forced itself upon the minds of the people themselves as soon as they understood the teaching and spirit of Christ. He believed he was right in saying, the people were in advance of some of their missionary teachers on this subject. Had he not himself been persuaded of the unchristian character of carnal warfare before he went to Samoa, he believed he should have been converted by the people he went to teach.

The terrible hurricane of a few years ago that shattered and wrecked, with great accompanying loss of life, the vessels of war of professedly Christian nations that were gathered in Samoa's harbor of Apia, ought to have bid this nation halt in carrying forward the scheme then being broached for a great increase of our navy; but the lesson of the incident was not welcomed. The annals of the time do not tell us how the serious-minded among the spiritually transformed Samoans regarded this awful event.

Referring again to thy letter, I should say concerning the point raised by thee, of traders provoking war, and soldiers following on to finish up matters, that the charge has been *at times* true enough. But it cannot by any means be taken as a truism. The "services" are very largely represented in the British parliament, and when any serious difficulty involving another nation is reported as brewing anywhere in the circle of the Queen's dominions and dependencies, an abundance of "jingo" talk is straightway heard in the halls of parliament. During the recent Chilean trouble, there was a large expression of decided satisfaction on the part of our naval officers at the prospect of getting into a fight and showing off our prowess and upholding the country's glory. But what an arraignment of the war system is found in the fact that the most unjust contests are entered upon and waged to the bitter end, whether originating in the fault of traders or otherwise, yet not an officer will be found who shall deliver up his sword, refusing to fight, and say, "My conscience and my God forbid me to take any part in this base matter." That would be deemed little short of treason. "Theirs' not to reason why."

I should not like to answer for the shortcomings and the actual guilt of traders generally in this connection, but thou canst hardly lay the responsibility heavily upon those of them who have been Friends. The annals of our province of Pennsylvania will tell thee that when the Indians were badly worsted after a time of war, with which Friends had naught to do except to try to keep the people out of it, contributions to the extent of several thousand pounds were gathered among their members, chiefly traders, and expended by them on the Indians' behalf.—Coincident with our Revolutionary war, the English and the French being also at war, a part owner of two British vessels which, taking out *letters of marque*, made several captures from the French, was a certain Friend of Falmouth. Obtaining his share of the prizes, which he could not conscientiously retain, he promptly sent his son, a physician, to Paris, to seek out and advertise for the owners of the captured property with a view to its restoration, a most unheard of procedure. The owners were eventually found, their claims proved, and the money restored.—The verdict of history is that the Crimean war was a "huge blunder," not to say a great political crime. The

Friends exerted themselves to prevent its outbreak, and a delegation of them even went to the Czar in the interests of peace. After the unhappy struggle, two of their number, one at least a well-to-do trader, journeyed to the country of the Finns, who had suffered wretchedly in the war, and bestowed thousands of pounds of money, their own and that of their friends, to mitigate the hardships, want and suffering of that people, and to bind up the wounds of war.—An English manufacturer of chemical products had opportunity to amass a large fortune by supplying the government with certain manufactures which would have been made use of in carrying on a war in which England was then engaged, but he declined absolutely to take the contract, having regard to the worth of his principles, and the peace of his own mind. This man was a Friend of large scientific attainments, a minister in the Society, and, later, was appointed as one of the three trustees for the Duchess of Kent, the mother of Queen Victoria.

Upon the matter of the military drill being a beneficial exercise, I have to say that I have no objection whatever to a certain amount of simple drill for the young. My own son, one of the senior scholars at the Friends' Boarding-school of Westtown, is even now (in part) discharging the duties of instructor in gymnastics, in the course of it going through with a good deal of marching and trotting around generally, but the arms the boys bear are the Indian clubs for developing the muscles of their bodies. Professor Sargent, the well known instructor in gymnastics at Harvard, is authority for the statement that the usual military drill but awkwardly and imperfectly develops the body, and is a very indifferent substitute for intelligently pursued calisthenic exercises.

But the Boys' Brigade movement, started in Great Britain probably ten years ago, and less than four years ago in this country, I hold to be an experiment fraught with very great moral danger to our young people. "Whatever may be the purpose of its promoters," said a British journal a while ago, "it is an attempt to extend the Kingdom of Christ among the young by means of its *opposite*; for it is essentially and avowedly military, military in its organization, spirit, methods, adjuncts, accoutrements, ideas and associations." Even the patronage, in Scotland, of the talented author of "The Greatest Thing in the World," will not suffice, I feel sure, to prevent an untoward sequence of this movement, the eventual tendency of which I believe will be to develop feelings not accordant with those of universal benevolence.

A sturdy Cornwall objector, whose letter against the movement I lately read, wishes to know, "Why is it patronized by General Wolseley and other officers of high rank, who, if I have been rightly informed, went down to Glasgow to review these brigades, and to present colors to them? However well-intentioned the founders of this institution may have been, their foresight must be very limited not to see the ultimate designs of the interested parties who are watching behind the scenes, and insidiously waiting for the first opportunity to place their iron heel on the coming generation. I was at Manchester during the time of the exhibition there, when the Boys' Brigades were brought from Scotland to show their agility in military drilling. I heard then plenty of talk on what fine soldiers they would make, but not a word on Christ's Kingdom." It appears further, that the British Postmaster-General has ordered that all boys in future to be employed as telegraph messengers shall engage to join the

army at the termination of this service, and that they should perform military drill as a preparation for it. This is a long step, it seems to me, in the way of conscription. The development of the movement, it is probable, will be not dissimilar in this country if it unhappily be persisted in. Wm. Lloyd Garrison, a close observer, says of the drill in a late letter to Benjamin F. Trueblood, Secretary of the American Peace Society, "I have always raised my voice against it and refused to allow any of my boys to conform to the practice. It seems discouraging to attempt to stem the military spirit of the age, but the duty is all the more pressing, and the word must be spoken and the seed sown in faith."

It is proper to say here, that while the Salvation Army have taken up with military titles, they have no use for military weapons in their "Knee Drill" or other exercises and observances. I have read many accounts of their being subjected to taunts, stonings, blows and other violent demonstrations at the hands of the rabble, to all of which (so far as I have knowledge) they have submitted without reprisal, thus practically and instructively exemplifying the non-resistant principles set forth in the Sermon on the Mount. Thou wilt recall the newspaper accounts of repeated mobbings of the "soldiers" and "recruits" at Eastbourne, England. I retained for reference a remark of General William Booth, made at Brisbane, Australia, when visiting there last winter a year ago: "My mission is 'Peace on earth,'—peace in the minds, in the bosoms, in the families. I want to see real and lasting brotherhood, a brotherhood something more than a name, a reality."

I conclude my reply by quoting several lines from a true narrative lately told in verse by a lady (E. E. Hornibrook) touching the circumstance of an officer of the army being convinced by a providential incident of his mistaken, even wrongful calling, and laying down his commission in the army, to engage instead and without self-reproach, under Christ's white banner of peace. For a quarter of a century, my friend, I also have felt it laid upon me, according to ability, to display this standard. I feel that I must still continue to hold all war to be a barbarism, a crime and unchristian, even though in so holding, I should seem in the estimation of any, to discount the usefulness of what else I may have either written or have attempted to do in other directions for my neighbors' good. The selected lines referred to are these:

One night when he was preaching he laid aside his book,
A friend withdrew it quietly and out a pencil took,
On the fly-leaf sketched the preacher with a smile upon his face,
As bending down, entreating, with offers of God's grace,
On the other sketched the soldier with drawn sword in his hand,
His foot advanced, his visage set, with gesture of command.

The gospel preacher went his way, high thoughts his mind engage,
But in his room alone that night he saw the pictured page,
And he exclaimed, "O Prince of Peace! which truly is my mission—

To kill, or show the way of life, holding Divine commission?
To tell the story of thy love, which willeth men to save,
Or hurry them without a thought through suffering to a grave?"

He laid down his commission in the army of the State,
But in the ranks of Christ the King to-day is truly great;
In his heart there is no turmoil or din of earthly strife,
But the sweet calm which crowns alone a consecrated life,
And many bless the man of peace who guides them in the way
Of doing good for Him who came to save and not to slay.

Thy friend truly,

JOSIAH W. LEEDS.